

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

dm

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/212, 726 12/15/98 SCHUEGRAF

K M122-1098

EXAMINER

021567

MMC2/0616

WELLS ST JOHN ROBERTS GREGORY AND MATKIN
SUITE 1300
601 W FIRST AVENUE
SPOKANE WA 99201-3828

ART UNIT IN, E PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

6

06/16/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/212,726	Applicant(s) Schuegraf
	Examiner Erik Kielin	Group Art Unit 2813

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 15, 1998.

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 39-48 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 39-48 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2813

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 46 is objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant has used "cold hot" reactor which Examiner assumes is instead a --cold wall-- reactor as supported by the specification, page 11, second paragraph. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims **39-42, 47, and 48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Each of the independent claims (in bold above) requires "conditions which are effective to reduce the decomposition rate of the organic silicon precursor." In short, addition of H₂O or H₂O₂ tend to speed up rather than decrease the decomposition rate of the organic silicon precursor -- not reduce it.

Art Unit: 2813

Examiner respectfully submits that the only provision for reducing the decomposition rate provided in the specification is an *incorrect* application of Le Chatelier's Principle which can be found beginning on page 9, line 20. The information regarding the theory is incorrect for at least the following reasons: (1) The organic silicon precursor is *not in equilibrium* with the at least one of H₂O or H₂O₂ because both intermediate and product compounds of silicon are being removed from the system by deposition onto the substrate which, according to the aforementioned theory, *speeds up rather than reduces* the decomposition of the precursor. (See, for example, Applicant's admitted prior art article by IslamRaja et al., page 722, last paragraph, right-hand column.) (2) There is *no reverse reaction*, so an equilibrium cannot exist. Instead, each of the organic silicon precursors claimed by Applicant can only produce H₂O by reaction of the organic portion only, the reverse reaction is thermodynamically prohibited under the conditions presented by Applicant. (3) Assuming *arguendo* that H₂O or H₂O₂ were somehow in equilibrium with the organic silicon precursor, as both a reactant and a product, H₂O or H₂O₂ would tend to cancel each other out in effect of shifting equilibrium. As more H₂O (or H₂O₂) would be produced, more reactant and product would be introduced which would tend to cancel in effect to a degree determined by the stoichiometry of the reaction. Without a specific precursor, it is impossible to determine such stoichiometry and therefore impossible to determine the alleged degree of reduction -- again assuming *arguendo* such equilibrium exists.

Examiner acknowledges the well known fact that H₂O (or H₂O₂) is a product of the *net* or *global* reaction in the decomposition of the organic silicon precursors (IslamRaja et al. page 722,

Art Unit: 2813

equation (1) and paragraph thereafter) but H₂O (or H₂O₂) is **not** in equilibrium with the precursor and therefore cannot reduce the rate as alleged by Applicant in the specification. Consequently one of ordinary skill would find either *no change* in the decomposition rate or more likely an *increase* in decomposition rate of the organic silicon precursor as found, for example, by **Sukharev** (US 5,710,079; column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 13) for tetraethylorthosilicate (TEOS). Absent evidence to the contrary, the method as claimed would not operate as alleged.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 44 is considered indefinite because silane, SiH₄, is *not* an organic silicon compound as all organic compounds by definition must contain carbon.

6. Claims 39-42, 47, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2813

Applicant's claims 39, 47, and 48 are considered indefinite because the language "reducing the decomposition rate" is relative, but no reference point is provided so that it cannot be determined with respect to what rate the decomposition is reduced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

8. Claims 39-40, 42, and 43-44 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sukharev (US 5,710,079).

Sukharev discloses a method of depositing SiO₂ on a substrate using a H₂O/H₂O₂ CVD process in which an organic silicon precursor (for example, TEOS, and others as in claim 7) and H₂O and/or H₂O₂ are fed separately into a CVD reactor (column 5, lines 55-65) in a concentration of 0.5 to 6 percent (column 7, last paragraph). The H₂O may be introduced without H₂O₂ (col. 6, ln. 55). (See also columns 3-7; Figs 2-3.)

Because the concentration range claimed by Applicant in claims 40- 42 to provide conditions "which are effective to reduce the decomposition rate" (see specification page 12, lines 3-13) overlap those in Sukharev, the method of Sukharev must inherently "reduce" the

Art Unit: 2813

decomposition rate; although, Sukharev indicates that the rate would be increased due to the presence of H₂O/H₂O₂, as stated at the end of paragraph 2 above. *See In re Swinhart*, 169 USPQ 226,229 (CCPA 1971) (where the Patent Office has reason to believe that a functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty in the claimed subject matter may, in fact, be an inherent characteristic of the prior art, it possesses the authority to require the applicant to prove that subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess the characteristics relied on) and *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980) (the burden of proof can be shifted to the applicant to show that subject matter of the prior art does not possess the characteristic relied on whether the rejection is based on inherency under 35 USC 102 or obviousness under 35 USC 103).

Regarding claim 43, although Sukharev does not specifically indicate that the presence of H₂O and/or H₂O₂ decreases undesired reaction intermediates, Sukharev does indicate that the growing SiO₂ film has reduced carbon resulting. It is held, absent evidence to the contrary, that because the methods are disclosed equally that the method of Sukharev will inherently reduce the presence of unwanted reaction intermediates.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2813

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sukharev**.

The prior art as explained above discloses all of the limitations of claims 39-40 and 43-44 and 47, but does not teach applicant's concentration range of 5-15%. Instead, Sukharev discloses ranges of 0.5 to 3% H₂O and 0-3% H₂O₂.

However, it has been held that choosing parameters within or near ranges taught by the prior art is *prima facie* obvious. See *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976). See also *In re Huang*, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688(Fed. Cir. 1996)(claimed ranges of a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to choose a concentration with Applicant's range because Sukharev discloses the overlapping range of a combination of H₂O and H₂O₂ of 0.5-6%, according to the precedent set by *In re Wertheim* or *In re Huang*.

11. Claims 45-46, and 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sukharev** in view of **Wolf** (Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era, Vol. 1).

Art Unit: 2813

The prior art as explained above in paragraph 8 discloses all of the limitations of claims 39-40 and 43-44 and 47 except for specifically indicating that the CVD reactor is a hot wall (claim 45) or a "cold hot" reactor (claim 46) or using a hot-wall, low-pressure CVD reactor (claim 48) to deposit the silicon oxide film.

However, Wolf teaches that hot-wall, low-pressure CVD reactors are the most widely used reactors and are employed for depositing silicon oxide films because of their superior economy, throughput, uniformity, and ability to accommodate large diameter wafers on page 169, last 8 lines). Wolf also teaches the benefits of using cold wall reactors on page 171, first paragraph.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Wolf to the Sukharev reference for the reasons given by Wolf.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from examiner should be directed to Erik Kielin whose telephone number is (703) 306-5980. The examiner can normally be reached by telephone on Monday through Thursday 9:00 AM until 7:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Bowers, can be reached on (703) 308-2417. The fax phone number for the group is (703) 308-7382.

Application/Control Number: 09/212,726

Page 9

Art Unit: 2813

EK

Charles D. Bowers Jr.

Charles Bowers

Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

June 14, 2000